BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of May 21, 2019 Meeting

Chair, Aaron Moody, opened the Building Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21st, 2019.

Present: Aaron Moody, Vince Busby, Melanie Coyne, Michael Stephenson, Elizabeth Frere, Terry Knotts, Glenn Berry, Rodney Kiser, John Taylor, Zeke Acosta, Tom Brasse, and Andrew Kennedy

Absent: Paul Stefano and Brandon Brown

1. MINUTES APPROVED
Melanie Coyne made the motion to approve the minutes from the April 16th BDC Meeting, seconded by John Taylor. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBERS' ISSUES AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION ISSUES
No member or association issues.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES
No public attendee issues.

4. CODE HEROES
Patrick Granson thanked the following Code Heroes for their dedication to sustainability and life safety.
- Robert Serrano, Architect — dedication to plan preparation and coordination, and attention to detail (Note: could not attend, but we will still make remarks). Works out of Matthews does a lot of institutional work. Always a pleasure to work with him.
- Batson-Cook Construction — commitment to partnering with us to make your projects code compliant. Success stories – developed our skyline. Great job in being proactive, scheduling timeline and how to speed it up.
- Charlotte Douglas International Airport — commitment to partnering with us to achieve code compliance goals during airport upfits. Howard's team works with airport. Partner for over 15 years. Great communications in compliance and continued operations. A lot of advanced planning. Working together, always a pleasure.
- LS3P – proactive, great communications, and committed to doing the right thing. They do their code research always within line. Transformed downtown Charlotte. Makes things adaptable. Continue working on neighborhoods, they know their code research.

5. TECHNOLOGY UPDATE / ACCELA
Patrick Granson described what has been accomplished to date with Accela and the integration process. Starting with the Statement of Work, Melanie Sellers has been leading this effort. In October we submitted an RFBA asking for money from the general fund. BOCC approved that in October. Moving forward we are working with Accela on the gap analysis. We must obtain operations. There are still 88 items in the gap analysis in which we must determine ways to better the process without costing additional monies. Patrick introduced Tejinder Singh, the Senior IT Manager who further described where we are in the process.

TJ described that during our vendor selection, we began looking at what is available in the market today. Based on budget, Accela was a good fit. However; they do not have all the functionality we need. A full gap analysis for Code Enforcement and the Land Development side has been completed. The gap analysis includes functionality, out of box, and other items we will have to customize to ensure functionality is not lost. An estimator and scheduling solutioning will have to be created in house and have been resourced out to include a nonfunctional side within data migration with our current posse system.

PGG described that some vendors Acela and Computronix had schedulers but they didn't fit the functionality we require. Accela can create this solution in-house. Their cost for out of the box development will require an additional $1.6MM to complete and implement.

A. Moody asked if gaps were identified in the gap analysis? PGG answered yes.

G. Berry asked if these are things we already use today and it's still going to cost an additional $1.6MM to complete the current process?

T. Brasse asked if we had this information when we submitted the RFBA in October?

J. Taylor asked if we did a good job to describe what we needed in-house. Or did we do a poor job which is why there is more money needed. Did you know they didn't have a scheduling system?

PGG's response was, to build a cohesive system which included all, 148 items Accela would have to add processes not included in the cost.

M. Coyne asked if in-house meant, integration into the new system using staff? Yes.

T. Brasse asked how many people are working on this? PGG answered that we have two fulltime developers and processors and more positions will be added. PGG answered that this is the hard costs to get all implementation done within one year.

T. Brasse asked how does this relate to the budget? PGG answered that we currently have $400k to replace the system which will cost $1.2K. We will save $400K per year by switching to new Accela. Customers wanted one system, one portal, all in the same place.

J. Taylor asked if the items we were not aware of is the added cost and what is the cost per item? PGG shared that cost is per hour.

J. Taylor asked when Accela put their proposals together did they allocate for gap analysis items? PGG said they did not, nor did Computronix.

M. Coyne asked what were the other bids? PGG shared that other vendors backed out when we walked them through our process. Accela gives more platforms for all.

A. Moody asked if national companies were comparable? PGG shared that nationally, vendors have not seen anything like our operations. We are very technologically heavy.

G. Berry asked if Accela will market this process after completion for Mecklenburg County? PGG said, yes, they can market this process. Sages did the same thing.

A. Moody said that for us to customize a process is to teach in-house developers to do the work for us.

M. Coyne asked that at the end of year one we have used up all hours, what other costs will we be facing? PGG said that in the gap analysis, Accela is familiar with our current operations because we walked them through every step of our process. We do not expect any new processes or wild cards.

A. Moody asked if the cost will drop in 3-5 years? PGG said we assumed 7% and they can't go above 7%.

J. Taylor asked if the maintenance side for upgrades represents our yearly costs?

T. Brasse said at this time we don't even know what it looks like with the City since it is two platforms coming together. PGG shared with the group that Code Enforcement is responsible for 80% of the work. Once implemented we can work together on the platform portal. Operational systems are compatible.

D. Canaan shared that with the City having both Accela and Computronix it will be easier to migrate.

T. Brasse said, we have spent money for the best platform and now we need another $1.6MM for implementation. PGG explained that there may be an outlay of more than $400k, to obtain the systems customers and the BDC have asked for.

D. Canaan shared that Land Development recently expanded Accela throughout their processes.

A. Moody stated; to avoid the cost overruns and the efforts, in which the division has committed, is resulting in additional costs. Aaron has the same concerns as Tom Brasse, that we are spending more money. The $1.8MM cost was to cover everything, even the unknowns.

M. Coyne asked if Accela has an incentive to produce the product on time? PGG will look into this.

T. Brasse asked, how certain are we that that we've captured the entire scope of work at this point? PGG stated that we have provided Accela everything we have presented to you today.

J. Taylor ask if there is a consultant within the market to do a quick audit to ensure we are not being taking advantage of in number of hours total hours or is this inline (a professional to review the accuracy of cost)?

T. Brasse asked if he Department is asking the BDC to approve the additional $1.6MM. PGG responded that we are not asking for approval today. We just want you, the BDC to review and understand the platform.

Z. Acosta asked if they are attempting to better develop their own system, so they can sell it to others out of the box?

T. Brasse asked if this is an amendment to the contract? Allowing them the opportunity to add proprietary language should they sell it to another company?

A. Moody asked if the additional funds are firm to provide service delivery or is this just an estimate? And, if they exceed the hours agreed to; does Accela take the loss. Do we change the contract at this point, with a fixed time constraint and cost?

T. Brasse asked who was on the vendor approval original committee. Tom Brasse, Ebenezer Gujjarlapudi, Melanie Coyne and Glenn Berry were on the committee to review vendors.

T. Brasse asked to look at original cost, original scope, contact, and what this double cost consists of. Aaron and Melanie said they would like to look at this information as well.

M. Coyne said she would also like to see the elements, how it's apprised, and all components of the current state. This is not just about integration with the City. This is a dramatic change from what we have now.

The BDC approved a $1.8MM RFBA and now Accela is asking for an additional $1.6 MM. Specifically, where is the money going and what are the services we are paying for.

Patrick will share this information with Ebenezer Gujjarlapudi and ask for a meeting with Accela and the BDC.

6. Patrick Granson and David Gieser discussed a policy to mirror in building code exempt Level 1 and Level 2. Level 3 is gut and rebuild having to bring this into code compliance. With more detail, we want to reserve the right for a gut and redo or a significant change. This is an attempt to marry-up with Special Inspections. David Gieser reached out to the state. Dave received the information on existing building permits. Jeff Vernon has completed the scoping letter from Mecklenburg County.

G. Berry asked if DOI was involved and was told that the Department has tried to reach DOI for implementation. He also asked when we will be getting this out? Dave shared that SI has changed drastically and he hopes to get this out as a package this week.

7. Melanie Coyne asked in our last meeting if the Department can go back and give the BDC an update on service delivery. Sophia Hollingsworth ran a report saying that 85% is the overall answer rate. IT runs the application as to how many calls are made to 980.314.2633 in general. We learned that weekends, Saturdays and holidays are included in the abandoned call rate. You have received our phone trees for Code Enforcement showing a 95% answer rate. IT was calculating all call volume; not just working hours.

8. APRIL STATISTICS
Permit Revenue
- April permit (only) rev $2,505,390 compared to March permit (only) rev $2,523,179 FY19 budget projected monthly permit rev; $2,277,632
- YTD <u>permit</u> rev = $24,572,441 is above projected rev ($22,776,320) by $1,796,121 or 7.89%

Permits Issued:

	March	April	3 Month Trend
Residential	5098	5868	4251/5098/5868
Commercial	2623	3408	2614/2623/3408
Other (Fire/Zone)	277	323	435/7998/323
Total	7998	9599	7300/7998/9599

- Changes (Mar/April); Residential up 13.1%; commercial up 23%; total up 16.7%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Mar	Apr	Insp. Perf.	Mar	Apr
Bldg.	8,945	8,976	**Bldg.**	8,951	8,693
Elec.	9,264	9,718	**Elec.**	7,907	8,435
Mech.	4,868	4,913	**Mech.**	4,400	4,473
Plbg.	4,512	4,472	**Plbg.**	3,783	3,763
Total	27,589	28,079	**Total**	25,041	25,364

- Changes (Mar-Apr); requests up 1.8%; inspect performed up 2.38% overall
- Insp performed were 91% of insp. requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Mar	**Apr**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**Mar**	**Apr**
Bldg	88	89	99	99	99.7	99.8	1.19	2.09
Elec.	80	88	98	99	99.8	99.9	1.21	1.12
Mech.	82	88	99	99	100	99.9	1.19	1.12
Plbg.	92	94	99.7	99.7	100	100	1.07	1.06
Total	85	89	99	99.2	99.9	99.9	1.18	1.42

- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is **85-90%; April is currently 89%.**

Inspection Pass Rates for April 2019:
OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 83% in March was 84%

Bldg:	Mar – 76.57% Apr – 76.75%	**Elec**:	Mar – 83.68% Apr – 83.49%
Mech:	Mar – 87.37% Apr – 87.55%	**Plbg:**	Mar – 90.43% Apr – 89.39%

- Overall average at 83%, above the 75-80% goal range.

OnSchedule CTAC and Booking Lead Times for April 2019
CTAC:
- 108 first reviews, compared to 96 in March
- Project approval rate (pass/fail) – 64%
- CTAC was 30.51% of OnSch (*) first review volume

*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:
- January, 17: 217 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89% all trades, 90% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 17: 237 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91.35% all trades, 92.8% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 17: 279 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 88.7% all trades, 90% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 17: 216 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 90% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 17: 303 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93% all trades, 96% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 17: 277 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.8% all trades, 96% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 17: 260 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.02% all trades, 97% on B/E/M/P only
- August, 17: 282 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 96% on B/E/M/P only
- September, 17: 224 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91% all trades, 96% on B/E/M/P only
- October, 17: 236 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only
- November, 17: 243 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only
- December 17: 182 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 62% all trades, 70% on B/E/M/P only
- January 18: 210 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 68% all trades, 73% on B/E/M/P only
- February 18: 286 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89% all trades, 94% on B/E/M/P only
- March 18: 271 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- April 18: 283 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 90% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only
- May 18: 252 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93% all trades, 96% on B/E/M/P only
- June 18: 262 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93% all trades, 97% on B/E/M/P only
- July 18: 219 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 90% all trades, 94% on B/E/M/P only
- August 18: 272 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93% all trades, 97% on B/E/M/P only
- September 18: 207 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% on B/E/M/P only
- October 18: 212 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 88% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- November 18: 255 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 94% on B/E/M/P only
- December 18: 181 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 92% on B/E/M/P only
- January 19: 252 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 90% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- February 19: 278 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93% all trades, 94% on B/E/M/P only
- Mar 19: 254 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91% all trades, 92% on B/E/M/P only
- Apr 19: 302 – 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89% all trades, 94% on B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times
- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 29, 2019, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-25 work days booking lead,
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-25 work days lead,
  - 5-8 hr projects; at 2-26 work days lead,
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 3 work days, (all others @ 1 day)
- Express Rev'w booking lead time; 7 work days for small projects, 7 work days for large projects

Fire Marshal's Office
- Inspections Performed (new) – 77
- Plan Reviews Performed - 113
- Recurring Fire Inspections – 564
- Public Education Programs – 15

- Fire / Other Incident Investigations – 24

9. Manager/CA Added Comments
There were no additional Manager or CA comments.

10. Adjournment
The May 21st meeting of the Building Development adjourned at 4:13 p.m. The next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for June 18, 2019.